

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,753	01/11/2002	Donna Joy Guinn	98500/1098 9674	
75	90 01/11/2006		EXAM	INER
KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS			KUMAR, PREETI	
Attention: Patent Administrator Suite 1600			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
525 West Monroe Street			1751	
Chicago, IL 60661-3693			DATE MAILED: 01/11/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary	10/045,753	GUINN, DONNA JOY			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	Preeti Kumar	1751			
Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address -			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 Oc	ctober 2005.				
· <u> </u>	action is non-final.				
	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or					
Application Papers					
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. 					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa				

Application/Control Number: 10/045,753 Page 2

Art Unit: 1751

DETAILED ACTION

Final Rejection

1. Claims 1-13 are pending. Claims 1, 7 and 13 are independent.

Response to Arguments

- 2. The rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kneip et al. (US 5,702,490) in view of Liles et al. (US 5,321,075) is maintained for the reasons recited in the previous office action and further explained below.
- 3. Applicant's arguments filed 10/19/2005 have been fully considered but they are not found to be persuasive. Applicants urge that Kneip et al. do not teach a silicone emulsion consisting essentially of precured silicones. Further Applicants urge that Kneip et al. teach that it is the functionalized branched chain siloxanes that provide the water repellency.

Applicants arguments are not on point because Kneip et al. teach imparting water repellency to leather using a composition comprising polysiloxanes which encompass the broadly claimed category of "precured" silicone recited by the instant claims. The independent claims recite the language of "consisting essentially of precured silicone", which limitation is encompassed by the polysiloxanes taught by Kneip et al. Specifically the MPEP states that the language of 'consisting essentially of limits the scope of a claim to the specified materials and "those that do not materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the claimed invention". Kneip et al. teach various silicones impart water repellency including the claimed category of precured silicones and Liles et al. motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to treat textile with an

Art Unit: 1751

emulsion consisting of precured silicones since Liles et al. teach that precured silicones have a greater shelf life when used for coating textiles in general.

Applicants also urge that Liles et al. does not teach the polysiloxanes taught by the primary reference for imparting water resistance. Again, applicants argument are not found to be persuasive since the primary reference teaching of Kneip et al. already has established that silicones encompassing precured silicones impart water repellency to leather. The secondary reference illustrates a teaching of motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to select precured silicones to coat textiles in general since the teaching of Liles et al. indicate the benefit of longer shelf life.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1751

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Preeti Kumar whose telephone number is 571-272-1320. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra N. Gupta can be reached on 571-272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Preeti Kumar Examiner Art Unit 1751

PK

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINES
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700